

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

Michael Gerard Naessens,

Plaintiff

v.

Bradford McLane, et al.,

Defendants


Case No.: 2:22-cv-01438-JAD-DJA

Order Granting Motion to Extend Time

[ECF No. 21]

On October 26, 2022, pro se plaintiff Michael Gerard Naessens filed a document titled a “motion to extend time” to respond to defendant Bradford McLane’s motion to dismiss.¹ It appears, however, that the motion is actually a stipulation to extend time, as both parties agreed to the extension.² Regardless, the parties have shown good cause for the extension, so the motion to extend time [ECF No. 21] is **GRANTED**. Naessens’s response to McLane’s motion to dismiss is due by **November 10, 2022**, and McLane’s reply is due by **November 17, 2022**. The parties’ discovery plan and scheduling order is due by **December 11, 2022**.

Naessens is also reminded that defendants Amanda Leigh Hedrick and Lawrence H. Richardson Jr. filed a separate motion to dismiss on October 25, 2022.³ Naessens’s response to that motion is due by **November 8, 2022**.



U.S. District Judge Jennifer A. Dorsey
November 1, 2022

¹ ECF No. 21 (motion to extend time); ECF No. 11 (McLane’s motion to dismiss).

² See ECF No. 21 (requesting the extension of behalf of both parties, and including the signatures of both parties).

³ ECF No. 19.